

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

TAMIKA HUTCHINSON, ET AL.,

Plaintiffs,

Case No. 06-13579

v.

HON. GEORGE CARAM STEEH

STRONG, ET AL.,

Defendants.

_____ /

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO REMAND (#8)

At an October 10, 2006 Rule 16 conference, counsel for the parties appeared and discussed a pending motion to remand filed by plaintiff on September 18, 2006. Attorney Margaret M. Flanagan, for defendant Wayne County, voiced no opposition to the remand request given plaintiffs' counsel Thomas E. Kuhn's statement that plaintiffs have no intention of seeking to revive federal claims embodied in the initial complaint filed in Wayne County Circuit Court. Attorney Crow, for the City of Inkster, joined in the position stated by Ms. Flanagan. The court concluded that a ruling could be rendered without oral argument. See E.D. Mich. Local R. 7.1(e)(2).

The court recognizes that its decision on the remand motion is discretionary and that the court would have an opportunity to consider sanctions and/or retention of the state claims in the event federal questions are revived following the remand in this case. See generally Carnegie-Mellon University v. Cohill, 484 U.S. 343, 357 (1988) (recognizing court's discretion in exercising supplemental jurisdiction when all federal claims have been

eliminated through amendment).

Accordingly, plaintiffs' motion to remand to state court is hereby GRANTED. This matter is hereby REMANDED to the Wayne County Circuit Court.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 10, 2006

S/George Caram Steeh
GEORGE CARAM STEEH
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Copies of this Order were served upon attorneys of record on
October 10, 2006, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

S/Josephine Chaffee
Deputy Clerk